

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 23-29 are cancelled and claims 36-41 are new; thus, claims 16-22 and 30-41 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 16-35 stand rejected on prior art grounds. Claims 16, 23, and 30 stand rejected upon informalities. Claims 23-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claims 16, 23, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. More specifically, the Office Action argues that “Applicant is claiming as ‘inquiring whether an occurrence of an even [*sic*] has corrected predetermined code ...’ Clams [*sic*] 17, 24 and 31 are claiming as ‘classification code used for classifying said provisions...’ whereas the does not as claimed” (Office Action, p. 4, item 6).

Applicants have amended dependent claims 17, 24, and 31 to define “wherein said correct predetermined code comprises a classification code used for classifying said provisions provided in said document” (emphasis added). In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

Claims 23-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, because the Office Action asserts that none of the claims are directed to statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action asserts

that “[t]he claims are not producing useful, concrete and tangible results” (Office Action, p. 5, para. 1). Applicants respectfully disagree with such a conclusion.

More specifically, independent claims 23 and 30 define “providing a user with calculated results”; and as such, independent claims 23 and 30, and their respective dependent claims, provides “useful, concrete and tangible results”. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

III. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 16-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zambo, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,985,907) hereinafter referred to as Zambo, in view of McCollum, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0091640), hereinafter referred to as McCollum. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

As described in paragraph 0018 of Applicants’ disclosure, FIG. 1 schematically represents a general system architecture 110 for interpreting codes. Code 130 is mapped to target rules 140, the output of which is provided as input to a rule evaluation engine 150. The rule evaluation engine 150 also has as inputs a user perspective 110, and a triggering event 120. The rule evaluation engine 150 provides as output applicable provisions 160 of the code 130.

In the rejection, the Office Action argues that the prior art of record discloses many features of the claimed invention. However, nothing within the prior art teaches or suggests evaluating logic rules to select a code that is mapped to the logic rules. McCollum does not evaluate the “rules definition language 100” (which the Office Action asserts teaches the “logic rules” of the claimed invention) in order to *select a code* that is mapped to the “rules definition

language 100”. Instead, “[t]he purpose of the RDL 100 is to test assertions, enforce constraints using runtime information, make inferences, perform correlation, and communicate results of dynamic test to other component”. Therefore, as explained in greater detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

The Office Action argues that “McCollum teaches the claimed, *evaluating said logic rules in order to select said correct predetermined code*” (Office Action, p. 6, para. 1 (emphasis added)). Such features are defined in independent claims 16 and 30 using identical language.

In support of its arguments, the Office Action references paragraph 0029 of McCollum, and asserts that the “rules definition language (RDL) 100” of McCollum teaches the “logic rules” of the claimed invention. However, McCollum does not evaluate the “rules definition language” in order to *select a code*. Instead, “[t]he purpose of the RDL 100 is to test assertions, enforce constraints using runtime information, make inferences, perform correlation, and communicate results of dynamic test to other component” (McCollum, para. 0029).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that nothing within the prior art teaches or suggests evaluating logic rules to select a code that is mapped to the logic rules (See FIG. 1, items 130, 140, and 150 of Applicants’ disclosure). McCollum does not evaluate the “rules definition language 100” (which the Office Action asserts teaches the “logic rules” of the claimed invention) in order to select a code mapped to the “rules definition language 100”. Instead, “[t]he purpose of the RDL 100 is to test assertions, enforce constraints using runtime information, make inferences, perform correlation, and communicate results of dynamic test to other component”.

Therefore, it is Applicants' position that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the claimed features of "evaluating said logic rules in order to select said correct predetermined code" as defined in independent claims 16 and 30.

In view of the foregoing, it is Applicants' position that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest many features defined by independent claims 16, 30, 36 and that such claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Further, it is Applicants' position that dependent claims 17-22, 31-35, and 37-41 are similarly patentable, not only because of their dependency from a patentable independent claims, but also because of the additional features of the invention they defined. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

III. Formal Matters and Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 16-22 and 30-41, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 6, 2007

/Duane N. Moore/
Duane N. Moore
Registration No. 53,352

Gibb & Rahman, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (301) 261-8625
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154